arXiv:1409.0299v2 [math.AC] 20 May 2015

Ideal class groups of monoid algebras

Husney Parvez Sarwar

Department of Mathematics, IIT Bombay, Powai, Mumbai - 400076, India.

parvez@math.iitb.ac.in, mathparvez@gmail.com

Abstract

Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of commutative reduced rings and $M \subset N$ an extension of positive commutative cancellative torsion-free monoids. We prove that A is subintegrally closed in B and M is subintegrally closed in N if and only if the group of invertible A-submodules of B is isomorphic to the group of invertible $A[M]$-submodules of $B[N]$ (1.2 (b,d)). In case $M = N$, we prove the same without the assumption that the ring extension is reduced (1.2(c,d)).

1 Introduction

Throughout the paper we assume that all rings are commutative with unity, and all monoids are commutative cancellative torsion-free. For a ring extension $A \subset B$, the group of invertible A-submodule of B is denoted by $\mathcal{I}(A,B)$. This group has been studied extensively by Roberts and Singh [6]. Recently Sadhu and Singh ([7], Theorem 1.5) proved: *Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of rings and $\mathbb{Z}_+$ the monoid of positive integers. Then A is subintegrally closed in B if and only if $\mathcal{I}(A,B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[\mathbb{Z}_+], B[\mathbb{Z}_+])$.*

Motivated by this result, we inquire the following

Question 1.1 *Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of rings and $M \subset N$ an extension of positive monoids. Are the following statements equivalent?*

(i) A is subintegrally closed in B and M is subintegrally closed in N.

(ii) $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[N]$.

(iii) $\mathcal{I}(A,B)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$.

It is always true that $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$. If B is a reduced ring, then $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ is ([4], Theorem 4.79). We answer the above question in the affirmative by proving the following result. Our proof uses Swan-Weibel's homotopy trick.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of rings and $M \subset N$ an extension of positive monoids.*

(a) If $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[N]$ and N is affine, then $\mathcal{I}(A,B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$.

(b) If B is reduced, A is subintegrally closed in B and M is subintegrally closed in N, then $\mathcal{I}(A,B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$.

(c) If $M = N$, then the reduced condition on B is not needed i.e. if A is subintegrally closed in B, then $\mathcal{I}(A,B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[M])$.

(d) (converse of $(a), (b)$ and (c)) If $\mathcal{I}(A,B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$, then (i) A is subintegrally closed in B, (ii) $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[N]$, and (iii) B is reduced or $M = N$.

The following result which is immediate from (1.2), gives the exact conditions when $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$ in the above question (1.1).

Corollary 1.3 *Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of rings and $M \subset N$ an extension of positive monoids such that A is subintegrally closed in B and M is subintegrally closed in N.*

(i) If B is reduced or $M = N$, then $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[N]$.

(ii) Conversely if $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[N]$ and N is affine, then B is reduced or $M = N$.

Let A be a seminormal ring with $\mathbb{Q} \subset A$ and M a positive seminormal monoid. Then ([4], Theorem 8.42) proved that $Pic(A) \cong Pic(A[M])$. This result is due to Anderson ([2], Theorem 1) in the case when $A[M]$ is an almost seminormal integral domain (see [2], Definition). As an application of our result (1.2c), we deduce a special case of this result (see (3.5)).

Sadhu and Singh ([7], Theorem 2.6) studied the relationship between the two groups $\mathcal{I}(A, B)$ and $\mathcal{I}(A[\mathbb{Z}_+], B[\mathbb{Z}_+])$, when A is not subintegrally closed in B. Using our result (1.2), we generalize their result ([7], Theorem 2.6) to the monoid algebra situation in a straightforward way.

Theorem 1.4 *Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of rings and let ${}^{+}A$ denote the subintegral closure of A in B. Assume that M is a positive monoid. Then*

(i) the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}(A, {}^{+}A) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}(A, B) & \xrightarrow{\phi(A, {}^{+}A, B)} & \mathcal{I}({}^{+}A, B) & \longrightarrow & 1 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta(A, {}^{+}A)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta(A,B)} & & \simeq \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta({}^{+}A, B)} & & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}(A[M], {}^{+}A[M]) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[M]) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{I}({}^{+}A[M], B[M]) & \longrightarrow & 1 \end{array}$$

is commutative with exact rows.

(ii) If $\mathbb{Q} \subset A$, then $\mathcal{I}(A[M], {}^{+}A[M]) \cong \mathbb{Z}[M] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{I}(A, {}^{+}A)$.

2 Preliminaries

Definition 2.1 (1) Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of rings. The extension $A \subset B$ is called *elementary subintegral* if $B = A[b]$ for some b with $b^2, b^3 \in A$. If B is a union of subrings which are obtained from A by a finite succession of elementary subintegral extensions, then the extension $A \subset B$ is called *subintegral*. The *subintegral closure* of A in B, denoted by ${}_{B}^{+}A$, is the largest subintegral extension of A in B. We say A is *subintegrally closed* in B if ${}_{B}^{+}A = A$. A ring A is called *seminormal* if it is reduced and subintegrally closed in $PQF(R) := \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} QF(R/\mathfrak{p})$, where $\mathfrak{p}$ runs through the minimal prime ideals of R and $QF(R/\mathfrak{p})$ is the quotient field of $R/\mathfrak{p}$ (see [4], pg 154).

(2) Let $A \subset B$ and $A' \subset B'$ be two ring extensions. A morphism ϕ between the pairs $(A, B) \to (A', B')$ is a ring homomorphism $\phi : B \to B'$ with $\phi(A) \subset A'$. For a ring extension $A \subset B$, if $\mathcal{I}(A, B)$

denotes the multiplicative group of invertible A-submodules of B, then $\mathcal{I}$ is a functor from the category of ring extensions to the category of abelian groups. Let $\mathcal{I}(\phi)$ denote the group homomorphism which is induced by the morphism ϕ of a ring extension. If $B \subset B'$ and $A \subset A'$, then the inclusion map $i : B \to B'$ defines a morphism of pairs $(A, B) \to (A', B')$. We will denote $\mathcal{I}(i)$ by $\theta(A, B)$. For basic facts pertaining to ring extensions and the functor $\mathcal{I}$, we refer the reader to [6].

(3) Let $M \subset N$ be an extension of monoids. The extension $M \subset N$ is called *elementary subintegral* if $N = M \cup xM$ for some x with $x^2, x^3 \in M$. If N is a union of submonoids which are obtained from M by a finite succession of elementary subintegral extensions, then the extension $M \subset N$ is called *subintegral*. The *subintegral closure* of M in N, denoted by ${}^+_N M$, is the largest subintegral extension of M in N. We say M is *subintegrally closed* in N if ${}^+_N M = M$. Let $gp(M)$ denote the group of fractions of the monoid M. We say M is *seminormal* if it is subintegrally closed in $gp(M)$.

(4) For a monoid M, let $U(M)$ denote the group of units of M. If $U(M)$ is a trivial group, then M is called *positive*. If M is finitely generated, then M is called *affine* .

For basic definitions and facts pertaining to monoids and monoid algebras, we refer the reader to (Ch.2, Ch.4 of [4]).

Notation: For a ring A, $Pic(A)$ denotes the Picard group of A, $U(A)$ denotes the multiplicative group of units of A and $nil(A)$ denotes the nil radical of A.

We note down some results for later use.

The following result which follows with a repeated applications of ([7], Corollary 1.6), is due to Sadhu and Singh.

Lemma 2.2 *Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of rings. Then A is subintegrally closed in B if and only if $A[\mathbb{Z}_+^r]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[\mathbb{Z}_+^r]$ for any integer $r > 0$.*

The following result is ([4], Theorem 4.79) by observing that $sn_B(A)$ (the seminormalization of A in B) is same as ${}^+_B A$ (the subintegral closure of A in B) in our notation.

Lemma 2.3 *Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of reduced rings and $M \subset N$ an extension monoids. Then ${}^+_B A[N \cap sn(M)]$ is the subintegral closure of $A[M]$ in $B[N]$, where $sn(M)$ is the seminormalization (subintegral closure) of M in $gp(M)$.*

3 Main Results

The following result is motivated from ([1], Lemma 5.7).

Lemma 3.1 *Let $R = R_0 \oplus R_1 \oplus \cdots$ and $S = S_0 \oplus S_1 \oplus \cdots$ be two positively graded rings with $R \subset S$ and $R_i \subset S_i, \forall i \geq 0$. If the canonical map $\theta(R, S) : \mathcal{I}(R, S) \to \mathcal{I}(R[X], S[X])$ is an isomorphism, then the canonical map $\theta(R_0, S_0) : \mathcal{I}(R_0, S_0) \to \mathcal{I}(R, S)$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof This result uses Swan-Weibel's homotopy trick. Let $j : (R_0, S_0) \to (R, S)$ be the inclusion map and $\pi : (R, S) \to (R_0, S_0)$ the canonical surjection defined as $\pi(s_0 + s_1 + \cdots + s_r) = s_0$, where $s_o + s_1 + \cdots + s_r \in S$. Then $\pi j = Id_{(R_0,S_0)}$. Applying the functor $\mathcal{I}$, we get that $\mathcal{I}(\pi)\theta(R_0, S_0) = Id_{\mathcal{I}(R_0,S_0)}$, where $\theta(R_0, S_0) = \mathcal{I}(j)$. Hence the canonical map $\theta(R_0, S_0)$ is injective. So we have to prove that $\theta(R_0, S_0)$ is surjective.

Let $e_0, e_1 : (R[X], S[X]) \to (R, S)$ be two evaluation maps defined as $X \to 0, X \to 1$ respectively and i the inclusion map from $(R, S) \to (R[X], S[X])$. Then we get that $e_0 i = e_1 i$. Let $w : (R, S) \to (R[X], S[X])$ be a map defined as $w(s) = s_0 + s_1 X + \cdots + s_r X^r$, where $s = s_0 + s_1 + \cdots + s_r \in S$. It is easy to see that w is a ring homomorphism from $S \to S[X]$ and moreover w is a morphism of ring extensions i.e. $w(R) \subset R[X]$. It is easy to see that $e_0 w = j\pi \cdots (a)$.

Since $e_0 i = e_1 i = Id_{(R,S)}$, we get that $\mathcal{I}(e_0)\theta(R, S) = \mathcal{I}(e_1)\theta(R, S) = Id_{\mathcal{I}(R,S)}$ (Recall that $\theta(R, S) = \mathcal{I}(i)$). Therefore $\mathcal{I}(e_0)$ and $\mathcal{I}(e_1)$ are inverses of the canonical isomorphism $\theta(R, S)$. Hence $\mathcal{I}(e_0) = \mathcal{I}(e_1)$. By (a), we have $\mathcal{I}(e_0)\mathcal{I}(w) = \theta(R_0, S_0)\mathcal{I}(\pi)$. Hence $\mathcal{I}(e_1)\mathcal{I}(w) = \theta(R_0, S_0)\mathcal{I}(\pi)$. Note that $\mathcal{I}(e_1)\mathcal{I}(w) = Id_{\mathcal{I}(R,S)} = \theta(R_0, S_0)\mathcal{I}(\pi)$. Therefore we get that $\theta(R_0, S_0)$ is surjective. This completes the proof. ■

The following result is ([4], Theorem 4.79) when the ring extension is reduced. We use the same arguments as in ([4], Theorem 4.42, 4.79) to prove the following result. For an alternate proof of the following result, see Remark (3.3).

Lemma 3.2 *Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of rings and M an affine monoid. Assume that A is subintegrally closed in B. Then $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[M]$.*

Proof It is easy to see that $A[gp(M)] \cap B[M] = A[M]$. Hence it is enough to prove that $A[gp(M)]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[gp(M)]$. Since M is affine, $gp(M) \cong \mathbb{Z}^r$ for some integer $r > 0$. Hence we have to prove that $A[\mathbb{Z}^r]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[\mathbb{Z}^r]$. Since subintegrality commutes with localization (see [4], Theorem 4.75d), we have only to prove that $A[\mathbb{Z}_+^r]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[\mathbb{Z}_+^r]$. This is indeed the case because of (2.2). ■

3.1 Proof of the Theorem (1.2)

(a) Since N is positive affine, N has a positive grading by ([4], Proposition 2.17f). Since M is a submonoid of N, it has a positive grading induced from N. Therefore both $A[M]$ and $B[N]$ have positive gradings. Hence we can write $A[M] = A_0 \oplus A_1 \oplus \cdots$ and $B[N] = B_0 \oplus B_1 \oplus \cdots$ with $A_0 = A$, $B_0 = B$. We define $R := A[M]$, $S := B[N]$ and $R_0 := A$, $S_0 := B$. By the hypothesis, R is subintegrally closed in S, hence by ([7], Theorem 1.5), $\mathcal{I}(R, S) \cong \mathcal{I}(R[X], S[X])$. Therefore by Lemma (3.1), we get that $\mathcal{I}(A, B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$.

(b) First assume that N is affine. Since B is reduced, by (2.3), the subintegral closure of $A[M]$ in $B[N]$ is ${}_B^+A[N \cap sn(M)]$. Note that $sn(M) = {}_{gp(M)}^+M$ in our notation. It is easy to see that ${}_N^+M = N \cap {}_{gp(M)}^+M$. By hypothesis, ${}_B^+A = A$ and ${}_N^+M = M$. Hence $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[N]$. Therefore by (a), we get that $\mathcal{I}(A, B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$.

Now the case when N is not affine. Let $\Lambda := \{N_i : i \in I\}$ be the set of all affine submonoids of N. Then Λ forms a directed set by defining $N_i \leq N_j$ if N_i is a submonoid of N_j. Let $M_i := M \cap N_i$, where $N_i \in \Lambda$. Since M is subintegrally closed in N, it is easy to see that M_i is subintegrally closed in N_i. Then $N = \cup_{N_i \in \Lambda} N_i$ and $M = \cup M_i$. If $N_i \leq N_j$, then there exist a morphism of ring extension $\phi_{ij} : (A[M_i], B[N_i]) \to (A[M_j], B[N_j])$ induced from the inclusion map $B[N_i] \to B[N_j]$. Hence $(\{(A[M_i], B[N_i])\}_{N_i \in \Lambda}, \{\phi_{ij}\}_{N_i \leq N_j})$ forms a directed system in the category of ring extensions. Then the direct limit of this system is $((A[M], B[N]), \{\phi_i\})$, where $\phi_i : (A[M_i], B[N_i]) \to (A[M], B[N])$ i.e. $\varinjlim_{\Lambda}(A[M_i], B[N_i]) = (A[M], B[N])$.

Similarly as in the above paragraph one sees that $(\mathcal{I}(A[M_i], B[N_i])_{N_i \in \Lambda}), \{\mathcal{I}(\phi_{ij})\}_{N_i \leq N_j})$ forms a directed system in the category of abelian groups.

We want to prove that $\varinjlim_{\Lambda}(\mathcal{I}(A[M_i], B[N_i])) \cong \mathcal{I}(\varinjlim_{\Lambda}(A[M_i], B[N_i])) = \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$. For each N_i, we have a map $\mathcal{I}(j) : \mathcal{I}(A[M_i], B[N_i]) \to \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$ induced by the inclusion map $j : B[N_i] \to B[N]$. Hence by the universal property of the direct limit, there exist a map

$$\phi : \varinjlim_{\Lambda}(\mathcal{I}(A[M_i], B[N_i])) \to \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N]).$$

We claim that ϕ is an isomorphism. For surjectivity, let $I \in \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$. Hence there exist $N_k \in \Lambda$ such that $I \in \mathcal{I}(A[M_k], B[N_k])$. Taking the image of I inside $\varinjlim_{\Lambda}\mathcal{I}(A[M_i], B[N_i])$, we obtain that ϕ is surjective. Since the natural inclusion $j : B \to B[N_i]$ induces an isomorphism $\mathcal{I}(j) : \mathcal{I}(A, B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M_i], B[N_i])$ for each N_i, we obtain that $\mathcal{I}(A, B) \cong \varinjlim_{\Lambda}\mathcal{I}(A[M_i], B[N_i])$. Now it is easy to see that ϕ is injective. Therefore we get that $\mathcal{I}(A, B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$.

(c) As in (b), we can assume that $M = N$ is affine. Then by (3.2), $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[M]$. Hence as in the proof of (b), we get that $\mathcal{I}(A, B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[M])$.

(d) (i) To prove that A is subintegrally closed in B, let $b \in B$ with $b^2, b^3 \in A$. Let $m \in M$. Let $I := (b^2, 1 - bm)$ and $J := (b^2, 1 + bm)$ be two $A[M]$-submodules of $B[N]$. Note that $IJ \subset A[M]$ and $(1 - bm)(1 + bm)(1 + b^2m^2) = 1 - b^4m^4 \in IJ$. Hence $1 = b^4m^4 + 1 - b^4m^4 \in IJ$ i.e. $IJ = A[M]$. Therefore $I \in \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$. Let π be the natural surjection from $B[N] \to B$ sending $N \to 0$. Then $\mathcal{I}(\pi)(I) = A$. By hypothesis $\mathcal{I}(\pi)$ is an isomorphism, hence $I = A[M]$. Therefore $b \in A$. Hence A is subintegrally closed in B.

(ii) Let $g \in B[N]$ such that $g^2, g^3 \in A[M]$. Let $I := (g^2, 1+g+g^2)$ and $J := (g^2, 1-g+g^2)$ be two $A[M]$-submodules of $B[N]$. Then $(1 + g + g^2)(1 - g + g^2) = (1 + g^2 + g^4) \in IJ \Rightarrow 1 + g^2 \in IJ \Rightarrow 1 = g^4 + (1 + g^2)(1 - g^2) \in IJ$. Note that $IJ \subset A[M]$, hence $IJ = A[M]$. Therefore $I \in \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N])$. Let $\pi(g) = b \in B$ (π is defined in (i)). Then $\mathcal{I}(\pi)(I) = (b^2, 1 - b + b^2)$. Since $g^2, g^3 \in A[M]$, we obtain that $b^2, b^3 \in A$. But A is subintegrally closed in B by (i), hence we get that $b \in A$. Hence $\mathcal{I}(\pi)(I), \mathcal{I}(\pi)(J)$ are contained in A. Therefore $\mathcal{I}(\pi)(I) = A \Rightarrow I = A[M]$. Hence $g \in A[M]$. This proves that $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[N]$.

(iii) Let us look at the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}(A,B) & \xrightarrow{\phi_1} & \mathcal{I}(A/nil(A), B/nil(B)) \\ \downarrow \phi_2 & & \downarrow \phi_3 \\ \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[N]) & \xrightarrow{\phi_4} & \mathcal{I}(\frac{A[M]}{nil(A)[M]}, \frac{B[N]}{nil(B)[N]}), \end{array}$$

where ϕ_i are natural maps $\forall i$. By (i), we get that A is subintegrally closed in B, hence by ([7], Lemma 1.2), $nil(B) \subset A$. Hence $nil(B) = nil(A)$. Therefore by ([6], Proposition 2.6), we get that ϕ_1 is an isomorphism. Since N is a cancellative torsion-free monoid, by ([4], Theorem 4.19), $nil(B[N]) = nil(B)[N]$. By (c), we get that ϕ_3 is an isomorphism. Hence ϕ_2 is an isomorphism if and only if ϕ_4 is an isomorphism. By ([6], Proposition 2.7), ϕ_4 is an isomorphism if and only if $(1 + nil(B)[N])/(1 + nil(A)[M])$ is a trivial group. Since $nil(B) = nil(A)$ this is equivalent to $nil(B) = 0$ (i.e. B is reduced) or $M = N$. ■

Remark 3.3 If A is subintegrally closed in B and $M = N$, then we obtain $\mathcal{I}(A, B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[M], B[M])$ from the arguments as in $(1.2d(iii))$ without using Lemma (3.2). Hence using $(1.2(d(ii)))$, we get that $A[M]$ is subintegrally closed in $B[M]$. This gives an alternate proof of Lemma (3.2) without the hypothesis that M is affine. ■

Corollary 3.4 *Let $A \subset B$ be an extension of reduced rings such that A is subintegrally closed in B. Then $\mathcal{I}(A, B) \cong \mathcal{I}(A[X_1, \ldots, X_m], B[X_1, \ldots, X_m, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n])$.*

Proof Observe that the submonoid generated by $(X_1, \ldots, X_m)$ is subintegrally closed in the monoid generated by $(X_1, \ldots, X_m, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$. Hence we obtain the result using $(1.2(b))$. ■

In the following remark, we give an application of the result $(1.2(c))$.

Remark 3.5 (cf. [7] Remark 1.8) Let A be a seminormal ring which is Noetherian or an integral domain. Let M be a positive seminormal monoid. Let K be the total quotient ring of A. Then K is a finite product of fields, hence $Pic(K)$ is a trivial group. By Anderson ([3], Corollary 2), $Pic(K[M])$ is a trivial qroup. By ([4], Proposition 4.20), $U(K) = U(K[M])$ and $U(A) = U(A[M])$. Now using the same arguments as in ([7], Remark 1.8), one can easily deduce that $Pic(A) \cong Pic(A[M])$ from (1.2). ■

3.2 Proof of the Theorem (1.4)

(i) Following the arguments of ([7], Theorem 2.6), we observe that we have only to prove that the maps $\phi(A, {}^{+}A, B)$ and $\phi(A[M], {}^{+}A[M], B[M])$ are surjective. Since ${}^{+}A$ is subintegrally closed in B, $\theta({}^{+}A, B)$ is surjective by $(1.2c)$. Therefore we have only to show that $\phi(A, {}^{+}A, B)$ is surjective. But this follows from ([8], Proposition 3.1) by taking $C = {}^{+}A$.

(ii) If $A \subset B$ be a subintegral extension of $\mathbb{Q}$-algebras, then a natural isomorphism $\xi_{B/A} : B/A \to \mathcal{I}(A, B)$ is defined in [6]. As in ([6], Lemma 5.3) this yield a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}^{+}A/A & \xrightarrow{\xi_{{}^{+}A/A}} & \mathcal{I}(A, {}^{+}A) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle j} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta(A,{}^{+}A)} \\ {}^{+}A[M]/A[M] & \xrightarrow{\xi} & \mathcal{I}(A[M], {}^{+}A[M]), \end{array}$$

where $\xi := \xi_{{}^{+}A[M]/A[M]}$. Both $\xi_{{}^{+}A/A}$ and ξ are isomorphisms by ([6]. Main Theorem 5.6 and [5], Theorem 2.3). Now $\mathcal{I}(A[M], {}^{+}A[M]) \cong {}^{+}A[M]/A[M] \cong \mathbb{Z}[M] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} {}^{+}A/A \cong \mathbb{Z}[M] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{I}(A, {}^{+}A)$. ■

Acknowledgement: I am grateful to my advisor, Prof. Manoj K. Keshari, for his guidance, motivation and many useful discussions. I thank Vivek Sadhu for introducing his results to me and for some useful discussions. I acknowledge the financial support of Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (C.S.I.R.), Government of India. I sincerely thank the referee for his/her valuable suggestions and for pointing out the mistakes in the earlier version.

References

[1] D.F. Anderson, *Projective modules over subrings of $k[X, Y]$ generated by monomials*, Pacific J. Math. **79** (1978), 5-17.

[2] D.F. Anderson, *Seminormal graded rings II*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **23** (1982), no. 3, 221-226.

[3] D.F. Anderson, *The Picard group of a monoid domain*, J. Algebra **115** (1988), no. 2, 342-351.

[4] W. Bruns and J. Gubeladze, *Polytopes, Rings and K-Theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, 2009.

[5] L. Reid, L.G. Roberts and B. Singh, *Finiteness of subintegrality*, Algebraic K-theory and algebraic topology (Lake Louise, AB, 1991), 223-227, NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., **407**, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1993.

[6] L.G. Roberts and B. Singh, *Subintegrality, invertible modules and the Picard group*, Compositio Math. **85** (1993), no. 3, 249-279.

[7] V. Sadhu and B. Singh, *Subintegrality, invertible modules and polynomial extensions*, J. Algebra **393** (2013), 16-23.

[8] V. Sadhu, *Subintegrality, invertible modules and Laurent polynomial extensions*, arxiv 1404.6498 (2014).